COPY

R 47N

THE FOREIGN SERVICE
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
REVIEWED BY Jattaray DATE 3/19/82
RDS ☐ or DOE ☐ EXT. DATE
TS AUTH. REASON(S)
ENCLOSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐
DECLASSIFIED ☑ RELEASABLE ☑
RELEASE DENIED ☐
FA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

Office of the United States Political Adviser for Japan,
Tokyo.

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

Subject: ~~Informal Discussions on~~ the United States Standard Draft Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation

Participants: For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

Mr. Kenichi OTABE, Vice Director, Economic Affairs Bureau
Mr. Haruki MORI, Chief, First Section, Economic Affairs Bureau
Mr. Takeshi KANEMATSU, Secretary, First Section, Economic Affairs Bureau
Mr. Kay MIYAGAWA, Secretary, First Section, Economic Affairs Bureau
Mr. Masao OSATO, Chief, Fourth Section, Treaties Bureau
Mr. Mikizo NAGAI, Chief, Sixth Section, Economic Affairs Bureau

For the Office of the United States Political Adviser, Japan:

Mr. Jules BASSIN, Legal Attache
Mr. Dudley G. SINGER, Commercial Attache
Mr. Robert W. ADAMS, Second Secretary

Place: Office of the United States Political Adviser, Tokyo, Japan.

Date: Tuesday, April 8, 1952 FOURTEENTH INFORMAL MEETING

ARTICLE XX

Mr. Otabe stated that in order to avoid any possible differences in interpretation it should be clearly understood that the meaning of the word "transit", as used in Article XX, was the same as that used in Article V, paragraph 1 of the GATT, which states:

"Goods (including baggage), and also vessels and other means of transport, shall be deemed to be in transit across the territory of a contracting party when the passage across such territory, with or without trans-shipment, warehousing, breaking bulk, or change in the mode of transport, is only a portion of a complete journey beginning and terminating beyond

the frontier of the contracting party across whose territory the traffic passes. Traffic of this nature is termed in this Article 'traffic in transit'."

Mr. Otabe added that it should also be understood that "transit through the territories of each Party", mentioned in Article XX, includes passengers, baggage, and products carried by aircraft.

Mr. Singer replied that the GATT definition of "transit" was acceptable in interpreting Article XX, and that Mr. Otabe's understanding with reference to the inclusion of aircraft traffic was correct.

Mr. Otabe stated that under present regulations, export validations are required in Japan for the temporary unloading and trans-shipment of cargoes when those involve specific commodities subject to export licensing under Japan's security export control procedures. He asked for confirmation of his understanding that the implementation of security export controls would not be regarded as constituting "unnecessary delays and restrictions", as mentioned in Article XX.

Mr. Adams replied that Mr. Otabe was correct in his understanding, and that security measures, including export validations and licenses, were permissible under paragraph 1 (d), Article XXI.

ARTICLE XXI

Mr. Otabe referred to previous discussions on Article VIII (at the fifth meeting, March 7, 1952) when the Japanese side had proposed that the second sentence of paragraph 3 (i.e., "Nothing in the present Treaty shall be deemed to grant or imply any right to engage in political activities.") be deleted from that Article in as much as this clause was of general application. Mr. Otabe stated that this provision might more appropriately fit in Article XXI, and he now proposed that it be inserted in the latter Article.

Mr. Adams replied that when this clause was included in the provision on general exceptions in other United States FCN Treaties (for example in the Treaties with Colombia, Israel, Uruguay and others), the phraseology employed was: "The present Treaty does not accord any rights to engage in political activities". Subject to the views of the Department of State, which might prefer to use the terminology just mentioned, Mr. Adams suggested that this Article be amended as proposed by Mr. Otabe (i.e., that the second sentence, paragraph 3, Article VIII be inserted in Article XXI as paragraph 3-bis, for subsequent re-numbering in the final draft).

Mr. Otabe stated that the Japanese side earnestly desired that the second sentence of paragraph 3, Article XXI, reading, "Similarly, the

most-favored-nation provisions of the present Treaty shall not apply to special advantages accorded by virtus of the aforesaid Agreement" (i.e., GATT), be deleted from this Article. Mr. Otabe pointed out that if such concessions as are granted by the United States under a multilateral agreement (for example, GATT) not yet open to Japan, were to be outside the scope of the application of most-favored-nation treatment, the purpose of the present treaty prescribing unconditional most-favored-nation treatment would actually be defeated in practice. Furthermore, he said, since the United States is in fact granting the GATT concessions to Japan, the deletion of this sentence would have no effect on the actual relations between the two countries. He again pointed out that the present FCN Treaty will become a model for future treaties to be negotiated between Japan and other countries, and that it was feared that the inclusion of this sentence would establish an unfavorable and most unfortunate precedent, particularly in connection with early negotiations anticipated between Japan and countries already in the GATT.

Mr. Singer stated that the Department of State had proposed and secured the standard GATT reservation in previous negotiations on the assumption that the country concerned was actually free to come into the GATT, and that any failure on its part to be in the GATT, being of its own choosing, had no effect on the propriety of this reservation. He pointed out that it was not the desire of the United States to use the GATT reservation in order to impose unequal trade relations, and that the Department of State had indicated that some adjustment might be made in the present case in view of the special circumstances involved. There was as yet no definite idea as to what the appropriate solution might be, but it was believed that it should be in the nature of a clarification or qualification of the third paragraph.

Mr. Adams added that paragraph 3 was essential to the FCN Treaty, but that the American side would be most willing to consider any solution the Japanese side would desire to submit. He stated that a bilateral treaty could not, of course, commit the United States to any course of action inconsistent with its obligations under the GATT, and that it appeared therefore that any qualification suggested by the Japanese side should be made with reference to the second sentence of paragraph 3, and not to the first sentence.

Mr. Bassin added that the Department of State wished to reassure the Japanese representatives that their point of view was fully appreciated, and that it was prepared to approach this problem in a sympathetic manner, fully confident that a mutually satisfactory solution can be found.

Mr. Otabe replied that further consideration would be given this matter, and that the Japanese side would be prepared to discuss a proposed clarification or qualification of this paragraph, possibly at the next meeting.

With respect to paragraph 4, Article XXI, Mr. Otabe asked for a definition of "limited purposes". He asked whether a treaty trader or an employee of a Japanese company, permitted to enter the United States in connection with the activities of that company, might subsequently enter the employment of another company, for example of a domestic American firm, without violating the provisions of this paragraph. He also inquired whether employment in another Japanese firm, for example, a subsidiary or affiliate of the company originally employing this individual, would be permissible.

Mr. Adams replied that a treaty trader or an employee of the type mentioned by Mr. Otabe would be permitted entry into the United States as a non-immigrant, subject to specific limitations on his activities. He added that various types of visas of non-immigrant or temporary character are issued for entry into the United States; these are granted subject to varying conditions, qualifications or restrictions, and are valid for varying periods, ranging from a few months (for tourists) to an indefinite period of stay (for the so-called treaty traders). The latter are issued visas of indefinite tenure, valid for so long as they continue to promote trade and commerce between the United States and their country. These individuals could change employment while in the United States, provided, of course, the character of their employment remained unchanged and they continued to promote trade and commerce between the United States and their country. This change could be made with the prior knowledge and approval of the appropriate officials of the Department of Justice (the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States).

In reply to further questions put by Mr. Nagai, Mr. Adams stated that it is only the individual who enters the United States as an immigrant for permanent residence who is not subject to specific limitations or restrictions on his business or professional activities. Mr. Adams added that the Japanese employee previously mentioned by Mr. Otabe would not be permitted to resign from a Japanese firm in order freely to seek employment in the United States. It was possible, however, for this employee to leave one Japanese branch firm to work for an affiliate or subsidiary of that firm, or even for another legitimate Japanese enterprise also engaged in promoting commerce between Japan and the United States, without losing his treaty trader status, provided the prior approval of the Department of Justice were obtained.

ARTICLE XXII

Mr. Otabe asked for a clarification as to the difference between corporation and company, and for a definition of partnerships and other associations as used in paragraph 3, Article XXII.

Mr. Bassin replied that a company is a society or association of persons interested in a common object and uniting themselves for the prosecution of some commercial or industrial undertaking or other

legitimate business. The word, he added, is a generic and comprehensive term which may include individuals, partnerships and corporations. Furthermore, the term is not necessarily limited to a trading or commercial body, but may include organizations to promote fraternity among its members and to provide mutual aid and protection. He added that the word is sometimes applicable to a single entrepreneur.

Mr. Bassin stated that a corporation, on the other hand, is an artificial person or legal entity, created under the authority of the law of a state or subdivision thereof. It consists of an association of numerous individuals as a group under a special denomination which is regarded in law as having a personality and existance distinct from that of its several members. A corporation is vested with the capacity of continuous succession, either in perpetuity or for a limited term of years, and acts as a unit or single individual in matters related to the common purpose of the association within the scope of the powers and authority conferred upon it by law. The words "company" and "corporation" are commonly used as interchangeable terms. Strictly speaking, however, Mr. Bassin said, a company is an association of persons for business or other purposes and may be incorporated or not.

Mr. Bassin further stated that a partnership is a voluntary contract or association between two or more persons to place the money, effects, labor and/or skill of some or all of them in lawful commerce or business, with the understanding that there shall be a proportionate sharing of the profits and losses among them. An association, Mr. Bassin stated, is the union of a number of persons for some special purpose or business. It is generally an unincorporated society, and may consist of a body of persons united and acting together without a charter but pursuant to the methods and forms used by incorporated bodies for the prosecution of a common enterprise. The word "association" is a generic term and may at different times comprehend a voluntary association, such as a partnership, which is dissoluble by the persons who formed it, or a corporation dissoluble only by law.

Mr. Otabe stated that these definitions would be helpful in properly translating this Article into Japanese. He then asked if the various religious groups and foundations in the United States were considered juridical persons, and whether they were included in paragraph 3.

Mr. Bassin replied that organized religious groups and foundations may be juridical persons, but are usually unincorporated associations.

Mr. Otabe inquired whether a Zaidan Hojin was covered by paragraph 3, and, if so, what would be the nature of national treatment accorded such organizations in the United States. He explained that a Zaidan Hojin is a duly organized juridical person with given property, established for the purpose of employing or disposing of said property for a given public purpose. An example of a Zaidan Hojin, he added, would be an endowed private library.

Mr. Bassin replied such an organization would be considered a juridical person in the United States, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 3, if it were so considered in Japan. Although a Zaidan Hojin is not organized along the lines of the "companies" specifically mentioned in paragraph 3, it is intended that this paragraph cover juridical persons in general. A Zaidan Hojin, added Mr. Bassin, would be recognized as a Japanese juridical person in the United States, and it might be considered a corporation, company, association, or foundation depending on how its organization were interpreted under the appropriate laws of each state.

Mr. Nagai then asked what "juridical status" meant, and inquired whether the recognition of juridical status mentioned in paragraph 3 meant anything more than the recognition of the existence of a juridical person.

Mr. Bassin replied that "juridical status" meant "legal status", the legal position of an organization in, or with respect to, the rest of the community. The recognition mentioned in the second sentence of paragraph 3, he added, meant merely the recognition by either Party of the existence and legal status of juridical persons organized under the laws of the other Party.

It was then agreed that the next meeting would be held on Friday, April 11, 1952, with discussions to begin on Article XXIII.

/s/ M. Yukawa

Morio Yukawa
Director
Economic Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

/s/ Frank A. Waring

Frank A. Waring
Counselor for Economic Affairs
Office of the United States
Political Adviser, Japan